REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed on June 6, 2007. By the foregoing amendments, Applicants have corrected minor errors in the specification and have added three new dependent claims. The new dependent claims are supported by, for example, paragraphs 0004 and 0018-0022, and original Claims 7, 12 and 17. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

I.   Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1-27 over Matsuoka

Claims 1-27 stand rejected as anticipated by Matsuoka (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0010753 A1). Matsuoka discloses a dynamic web page delivery system that stores pages in a cache and retrieves requested pages from the cache. For example, if a copy of the requested web page has been cached, Matsuoka's system will retrieve it from memory and forward it to the web browser. Otherwise, Matsuoka's system generates a fresh copy of the requested web page, stores it in the cache, and forwards it to the web browser. Matsuoka's system does not prefetch, or preemptive retrieve, data used to generate a dynamic web page. In addition, Matsuoka's system does not seek to perform data retrieval subtasks in parallel in order to reduce the page generation time associated with the requested web page.

A reference anticipates a claim only if it discloses every limitation of the claim. See MPEP § 2131. Accordingly, the absence from the reference of any claimed limitation negates anticipation. Applicants respectfully submit that the anticipation rejection of Claims 1-27 is improper because, among other reasons, Matsuoka does not disclose all of the limitations of any independent claim.

Independent Claim 1

With respect to independent Claim 1, Matsuoka does not disclose, in the context of the other limitations of the claim, "a prefetch component that is responsive to a page request from a browser by using the mapping to identify a set of service requests to be made preemptively, such that service content that is deemed likely to be used by the template processor to generate the requested page is prefetched."

In connection with this feature, the Office Action points to Matsuoka's information retrieval system 32. Nothing in Matsuoka, however, suggests that this information retrieval system 32, or any other component of the system, prefetches content used to generate the

requested web page. To the contrary, the information retrieval system 32 operates by (1) determining whether the requested page has previously been stored in the cache; (2) requesting the page from the cache if it has; and (3) requesting a fresh copy from an application server if it has not. See Matsuoka at paragraphs 0023-0029.

<div align="center">Independent Claim 9</div>

With respect to independent Claim 9, Matsuoka does not disclose, in the context of the other limitations of the claim, "monitoring the performance of the task over time to generate a mapping reflective of frequencies with which specific data retrieval subtasks are performed as part of the document generation task." In this regard, the "memory map of cache files" described at paragraph 0028 of Matsuoka is not "a mapping of document generation tasks to corresponding subtasks that are performed as part of such document generation tasks."

In addition, Matsuoka does not disclose "using said mapping to identify a set of data retrieval subtasks that are deemed likely to be performed as part of the document generation task to generate the requested document." Further, Matsuoka does not disclose "initiating at least some of the data retrieval subtasks in said set before they are initiated as the result of the performance of the document generation task, to thereby prefetch data that is deemed likely to be used to generate the requested document."

<div align="center">Independent Claim 17</div>

With respect to independent Claim 17, Matsuoka does not disclose, in the context of the other limitations of the claim, "a monitoring component that monitors the template processor over time and generates a mapping of document generation tasks to corresponding subtasks that are performed as part of such document generation tasks." Matsuoka also fails to disclose "a prefetch component that is responsive to a document request from a client computer by using the mapping to identify a set of data retrieval subtasks to be performed preemptively, such that data retrieval subtasks that are otherwise performed sequentially may be performed in parallel."

In view of these and other limitations that are not disclosed by Matsuoka, Applicants respectfully submit that the anticipation rejection of Claims 1-27 is improper.

II.   Conclusion

By focusing on specific claims and claim limitations in the discussion above, Applicants do not imply that other claim limitations are disclosed or suggested by the references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding rejections and allow the application. If any issues remain which can potentially be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record at his direct dial number of 949-721-2950.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: September 5, 2007   By: /RJS38297/
                                                  Ronald J. Schoenbaum
                                                  Registration No. 38,297
                                                  Attorney of Record
                                                  Customer No. 20,995

3852842/dns
060707